



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Mr. Charles does not differ from his predecessors in thinking that the Hebrew text of Genesis may here and there be corrected from the Jubilees, but the ore (to use the language of miners) seems to the present writer very low grade. In the first place, the Aethiopic MSS. are interpolated from or under the influence of the Aethiopic version or versions of the Bible ; it is one of the merits of Mr. Charles's book that he proves this in the case especially of the MS. called A. In the second place, the old Greek translation of the Jubilees was without doubt influenced by the LXX. When, therefore, the Jubilees' text confirms the LXX., how can it be regarded as an independent witness ? "We shall now," says the editor in section viii. of his preface, "give a list of readings in the Massoretic text, which should be corrected into accord with the readings attested by such great authorities as the Sam., LXX., Jub., Syr., Vulg." The first witness called does not respond ; for in Genesis viii. 19, Mr. Charles's emendation coupling הרמש with (ה)רמש, is very probably right, but it is not the reading of the text of the Jubilees which he has published (v. 32, note 29). With regard to the rest, while the trouble he has taken in sorting the textual affinities of the book deserves recognition, it may be doubted whether the Jubilees has in any case the authority of a MS. For only those compilations and versions which are painfully literal have any such authority. Now the author of this book certainly had no particular scruple about altering, when the fancy took him, the text of Genesis which he reproduced or incorporated.

However, the present writer is tired of finding fault with a work which very few scholars, either here or abroad, would have been able to produce, and which is certain to be for a long period the standard work on the subject with which it deals. He will conclude therefore with the hope that unlike most of the *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, this *Anecdota* may prove a source of profit to the Clarendon Press, and that its author may find leisure and opportunity to do yet further services to the literature of Abyssinia.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

Via, Veritas, Vita ; Christianity in its most simple and intelligible form.

The Hibbert Lectures, 1894, by James Drummond, D.D.
(Williams and Norgate.)

THE last of the Hibbert Lectures is in some ways the most characteristic of the series. The previous volumes, of an unequal but high average of merit, dealt with the *rationale* of the chief historic religions. Dr. Drummond rationalises Christianity, reduces it as it were to its lowest terms, in a mathematical sense, and attempts to show how, when thus

denuded of dogma, it conforms to the requirements of Natural Religion and Absolute Ethics. It is appropriate to add in this place, that incidentally, although he does not know it, his Christianity, so far as it has the authority of its Founder, approaches very near to Judaism, even to the Judaism of the Pharisee.

I may best illustrate this statement by going through the plan of the book. The first Lecture deals with the *Quellen*. Christianity, it is argued, is not to be confined to the explicit teaching of Jesus, but embraces the total specific effect of his life. By putting his position in this form Dr. Drummond is enabled to make a qualified use of John's Gospel. He ingeniously argues that the writer of that remarkable *Tendenz-Roman* often interprets the spirit of Jesus more fully than the Synoptic Gospels, which he, like all his school, regards as alone historical. This is an ingenious method of getting over the *crux* of New Testament criticism : but carried out to its logical conclusion it would lead to the High Church position. If John, why not Augustine, Aquinas ? Why not Hooker, and Laud, and Pusey ? So far as the documents go, historic Christianity is more the creation of Paul and the unknown writer of John than of the historical Jesus as known from the Synoptics. If so, Jesus was rather the central figure than the central fact in Christianity as developed in history.

The next two Lectures deal with the Bible, the early Christian and the modern view of its authority. Here the attempt is made to make of Jesus the earliest rationalist, and not without some success. One cannot help feeling how Dr. Drummond's position might have been strengthened if he had a fuller knowledge of the contemporary Jewish view of the authority and the inspiration of Scripture. But here again the reflection occurs, how little effect the views of Jesus, if Dr. Drummond gives the right interpretation of them, have had upon the Church.

These chapters, I may add, are rendered valuable by an *éloge* of the Bible regarded as a source of spiritual elevation. Dr. Drummond has also an ingenious suggestion as to the value of parts of the Bible which the development of the moral sense has left far behind us ethically. Joshua and Esther might not be good examples for the grown up man, but they may develop courage and strenuousness in the growing boy. He omits to observe, however, that so far as the Bible has been operative in forming new types of human character, it has worked mainly through the Old Testament. It was the Old Testament, not the New, that gave a moral backbone to the Reformation.

With the fourth lecture Dr. Drummond enters upon his more specific subject. This deals with the important topic of the Kingdom of God. It is to be regretted in this connection that Dr. Drummond had not before him Mr. Schechter's admirable exposition of the Rabbinic ideas on

this subject (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VI., 640 *seq.*). Schürer, to whom he has to trust, is by no means satisfactory when dealing with the views of the "Pharisees," owing to his antipathetic attitude. Dr. Drummond would perhaps have learnt that, in his views upon the Kingdom of God, Jesus made no advance on the current conceptions of the rabbis, though here, as usual, he gave them crisp and memorable expression. Dr. Drummond has in this chapter the usual remarks about the formalism and legalism of the Scribes and Pharisees to which the Kingdom of God as preached by Jesus was to be so novel and marked a contrast. Yet he quotes the answer of the Scribe in Mark xii. 28, without seeing its significant bearing upon his statements. If a typical Scribe could express the fundamental principles of the Kingdom in such a way that Jesus could accept it as expressing his own views, where could have been the novelty of those conceptions? Nor has Dr. Drummond considered the bearing of the *Didache* on this incident. Dr. Taylor has suggested, and the high authority of Prof. Harnack has carried out the suggestion, that the *Didache* is merely a Christianised expansion of a Jewish catechism on "The Two Ways" of life and death. Prof. Harnack has gone further, and from the various redactions of the *Didache* has restored the earlier portions, at least, of the Jewish original. Now in the opening passage of this is contained the Scribe's answer in the form in which it is given in Luke x. 27, where the same incident is given as in the passage from Mark. It is clear from the context that some written authority is referred to, since Jesus asks the Scribe: "How readest thou?" If my interpretation of this passage is correct, "The Two Ways" was known to Jesus.¹

There is another passage made use of in this lecture, in which it would have been well if Dr. Drummond had taken account of recent Jewish research. M. Halévy has, with great ingenuity and plausibility, argued in the *Revue des Etudes Juives*, iv. 289, that the good Samaritan was not a Samaritan at all. In New Testament times, and down to the present day, the Jews have been divided into three hereditary classes, Priests, Levites, and Israelites. The division is referred to in the later Psalms, *e.g.*, cxxxv. 19, 20. It is retained to the present day in a few religious distinctions between the descendants of Aaron, of Levi, and of Israel. Thus Jews are "called up" to the Law in an order of precedence settled by their assumed descent. Derenbourg has suggested that the great Sanhedrim of seventy-one members was composed of three smaller ones, each of twenty-three, taken from these three sections, with the addition of a president and vice-president to make up the larger number. Now the only time that Jesus refers to a Levite is in the

¹ The Beatitudes also would be from this point of view merely an extension of the doctrine of "The Two Ways."

so-called parable of the Good Samaritan, where it could have no meaning apart from the traditional three classes. Jesus begins with the Cohen or Priest, goes on to the Levite, and we cannot help seeing, with M. Halévy, that he finished with the typical specimen of the third class, the Israelite.¹ M. Halévy adds that the frequent journeys of a "Samaritan" between Jerusalem and Jericho would be impossible. The point is an important one in two ways: if established, it would do away with any claim of Jesus to any greater Universalism than the Jews of the time, and, besides, would confirm the impression that his antagonism was directed against the sacerdotal class, who finally caused his death, rather than against the Pharisees, with whom he had so much in common, that it is almost impossible to distinguish them.

Similarly in the next lecture Dr. Drummond is only enabled to talk of the Christian doctrine of God by ignoring the Jewish. It is true that he gives (pp. 173-5) all the passages in the Old Testament in which God is expressly spoken of as the Father, but he contends that the relation is "used in reference to the nation or its representative rather than its individual members." Whatever may have been the case in Old Testament times, the early Jewish ritual shows that by the time of Jesus, the relation had become closely individual. Similarly with the doctrine of God's love and human responsibility ample parallels might be given from Rabbinic sources for the ethical "Christian" position with regard to them. On the other hand, it is fair to say that the concentration and the apt expression of these views by Jesus are unique in the history of Israel, or indeed of the world. Again, in the next two lectures dealing with ethics Dr. Drummond also proceeds by the method of contrast. He contrasts the externality of legalism with the inwardness of true morality, but passages could be quoted showing that the rabbis were almost equally alive to the dangers to which their system was liable, and like them it was against the excesses to which legalism might lead rather than against the legalism itself that Jesus protested. So far as Christianity is against legalism it is the child of Paul, not of Jesus. But the truth is, that so necessary is some form of legalism for human society, that the moment the Church became differentiated from the Synagogue it was forced to reinstate a legalism of its own. Here, as elsewhere, the doctrines of Jesus were merely supplementary to those of Judaism. It has been by a true instinct the Church has always bound up together the New Testament as a sort of appendix to the Old. Both the race and the individual have first to be strengthened by the law of righteousness before either can attain to freedom.

¹ When the antagonism of Church and Synagogue arose, it was easy to substitute Samaritan, who was a typical Israelite in another sense. The early Church always favoured the Samaritans, somewhat as the Czars favour the Karaites.

If this be so, it follows that Dr. Drummond's title is unjustified. It is indeed derived from one of those utterances which "John" puts in the mouth of Jesus, and has thereby given him that air of arrogance which repels the Jewish reader. Dr. Drummond notices the charge, and has an ingenious defence against it. If a man is thinking, not of himself, but of the truths he teaches, he may use, without offence, the grandiose sayings which John put in the mouth of Jesus. If that were so, he should make it clear that he is speaking of the truths, not of himself, and the text would run, *Doctrina mea, via veritas vita*. Still less was the more egotistical form justified if, as Jews contend, whatever truth Jesus had to teach was supplementary and derivative, not comprehensive and original. God is righteousness—the teaching of the Old Testament—is a more fundamental truth than God is Love. True freedom must be based upon Law and order. The Christian life is not a complete life; whenever the attempt has been made to realise it the result has been fantastic. Even with regard to corporal acts of charity it cannot be said that the results of practical Christianity have been altogether satisfactory. Many persons are seriously of opinion that "Philanthropy" has done, and is doing more harm than good. The battle of life is a battle, say what we will; retreat seems the only Christian method of warfare. After the fight is over there is work enough for love; during the fight all that we can ask for is strict justice. The antagonism of the Old Testament and the New, so far as it exists, can only be overcome in a similar way to that between individualism and socialism. Individualism has to develop the energy and resourcefulness of human character; Socialism has to mitigate the resulting inequalities.

Curiously enough, in their practical effects the functions of Judaism and Christianity are in an opposite direction to that indicated just now. The Christian scheme is individualistic in tendency, the Jewish was largely socialistic. The primary care of the Christian is his own soul, that of the Jew, his own nation. Here indeed is the most striking influence of Jesus. His own strong individuality, which takes such an arrogant form in the *logia* of John, has impressed itself upon his followers and given almost an anti-social bias to their lives. It was by this means that he brought a sword into the world and not peace. It was by his own want of interest in his nation that he brought about his death, and it was from the unpatriotic attitude of his early followers that the original schism between church and synagogue was caused.

In his final lecture, Dr. Drummond deals with the central problem of Christianity in a very suggestive, but not a very convincing manner. His problem is to find the motive force of Christianity, and he traces it in the first place to the generalising power of Jesus as a moral teacher, and in the second place to the mystic attraction of his personality, as exemplifying the divine sonship. According to him, Jesus was a kind

of Newton in moral philosophy, and by simplifying the law of life, made it more attractive and efficacious. He has here a passage which sums up his claims for Christianity, and may therefore be somewhat closely scrutinised.

“ But that the faith contained something startlingly novel and revolutionary is evinced by the almost universal hatred with which it was regarded. And, indeed, it drove its ploughshare through the Jewish vineyard, and laid its axe to the old tree of heathen superstition. To step forth from the ancient enclosure, and feel that Jew and Gentile alike were members of the great family of God ; to renounce the sanguinary and exclusive worship of the temple in Jerusalem, and offer up spiritual sacrifices to the Father of all in the temple of the universe ; to lay aside the venerable Law, which had been the hedge of monotheism and morality against the assaults of idolatry and sin, and to substitute for it a spirit within the heart, which might seem to the outsider an excuse for every kind of subjective caprice, though to the believer it expressed the immutable mind of God—this was indeed a momentous change, and the idea of Divine sonship which brought it about was quick and powerful, alike from its newness and its grandeur.”

The curious criterion, that the novelty of a creed is proven by the hatred which it arouses, is scarcely borne out by experience, which rather shows that the most internecine quarrels in religious matters, are between those who differ the least. But let us examine these novelties *seriatim*. Malachi had surely anticipated Jesus on the universal fatherhood of God in the passage quoted by Dr. Drummond, p. 175, and the divine sonship (of all men) is but a corollary. The fall of Jerusalem caused the Rabbis to adopt the fine principle that prayer is the substitute for sacrifice, without any prompting from Jesus and his followers, who seem to have acquiesced in the Temple sacrifices while they lasted. It was Paul, not Jesus, who “laid aside the venerable law ” after a struggle which showed that Jesus’ immediate followers were just as much attached to it as the most rigid Pharisee. Again, therefore, we are led to the conclusion, that so far as Christianity differs from Judaism it cannot claim the authority of Jesus.

It is only in his last pages that Prof. Drummond comes to the real problem. The ideal personality of a mystic Christ is the real differentia of Christianity from other religions. A real personality, like the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, could not be made into an ideal for all humanity. He himself was conditioned by the historic circumstances of his time, and those who would follow him would be limited to his authentic acts and utterances. But into the ideal figure of the Christ as created by Paul and John, each generation of men could read their own ideals, and have done so. The historic problem of Christianity is to trace how this purely ideal figure of Christ became attached to the name and life of

the Jewish peasant of Galilee. Dr. Drummond has some interesting passages on the influence of Philo in preparing the matrix for the new ideal, and there is no one better qualified than he to deal with this subject. One would have liked to have seen him also treat of its relation with the analogous conception of the Jewish Messiah, which he has also made the subject of special study. It is clear that the next stage of theological investigation must be both to separate and to deal separately with the historic Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, and the ideal Christ or Christs of Paul and John. Dr. Drummond has every qualification for dealing with the latter subject.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums. Von MAX FRIEDLANDER.
Wien : 1894.

THE following is an analysis of the contents of this important work :—

Chapter I.—“Die Göttliche Mittelkraft.” The Jewish idea of God was purified by contact in the schools of Alexandria with Greek philosophy, especially with Platonism. Anthropomorphic ideas were discarded, and the Logos introduced as intermediary between God, who is the author of good alone, and matter, which is transitory and evil. In the earlier period of Alexandrine Judaism, the Schechina, or *δόξα θεοῦ*, was regarded as such a divine intermediary power; and the Wisdom of God was similarly conceived.

Justin Martyr depends for his explanation of the distinction between the Father and the Son on this Alexandrine philosophy when he says that God before creation produced out of himself a self-conscious power (*δύναμιν τινα λογικὴν*) called the Holy Spirit, the glory of the Lord, *δόξα κυρίου*, and identical with the Son, with Wisdom, with an angel, with God, with Lord, and with the Word. This power issued from God without loss to him, just as the word issues from the human mind without loss to it or diminution of it.

The Book of Sirach, though a Palestinian work and originally written in Hebrew, is coloured by Alexandrine thought in its representation of Wisdom as a power mediating God with man and with the world. The Book of the Pseudo-Solomon, which is earlier than Philo, is still more definite; and Origen identified with the only-born Son and with the Logos the Wisdom which, according to that book, is *ἀτμὶς τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀπορροία τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινής*. This